

**AMAUROBIUS PROPOSALS: COMMENT ON THE ALTERNATIVE  
PROPOSALS MADE BY FR. CHRYSANTHUS. Z.N.(S.) 1625**  
(see volume 22, pages 216-217)

By Herbert W. Levi (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) and Otto Kraus (*Natur-Museum und Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt am Main, Germany*)

The alternative proposals made by Fr. Chrysanthus do not affect the main purposes of our original application: the stabilization of important generic names in Arachnology. They only deal with a special problem of the specific name of the type-species of *Coelotes* Blackwall, 1841.

The situation has already been discussed by us (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 22 : 140-141) and Fr. Chrysanthus (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 22 : 216-217). Fr. Chrysanthus favours the suppression of the name *Drassus atropos* Walckenaer, 1830, (a) for Walckenaer's original concept may well have been different from now established usage, and (b) because in the past the name *atropos* has not been universally used in the sense of the prevailing current use.

The sentence of Fr. Chrysanthus indicating that "Levi and Kraus's selection of a specimen of *Coelotes saxatilis* . . . to be the neotype of *Drassus atropos* . . . violates Article 75 (c) . . ." does not have a real basis: we never did select a neotype, we only made the technical proposal that the Commission should select such a neotype by means of its plenary powers.

We feel that *atropos* is such a well-known specific name that its suppression may lead to confusion. It is one of the old "classic" names in European Arachnology, which, up to 1939, has been cited more than 200 times. It is quite normal that, as in many other cases, the precise interpretation of such an old name is not always clearly established in older literature; clarity can be achieved by critical lists of synonymy only, not by the total suppression of such a name. But from O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879, through Simon, 1939, Locket and Millidge, 1953, up to Wiehle, 1963, there exists an increasing uniformity in common usage, which also has been adopted in general literature (e.g. Tretzel, 1961). Thus we strongly favour the stabilization of the name *atropos* in its currently adopted sense and by means of a neotype; it is essential to preserve this now uniformly established usage and avoid changing the name on the basis of chiefly historical reasons.

**COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR  
AMPLEXIZAPHRENTIS VAUGHAN, 1906 (ANTHOZOA). Z.N.(S.) 1669**  
(see volume 22, pp. 348-50, 1966)

By M. Mitchell (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*)

In supporting Dr. Chiranjivi Lal Shrestha's proposal in this case, I wish to bring out a number of points not clearly stated in his application.

2. Vaughan (in Matley and Vaughan 1906, p. 315), in proposing the subgeneric name *Amplexi-Zaphrentis* without including any species by name, referred to Thomson, Proc. Phil. Soc. Glasgow, vol. xiv (1882-83) pl. vi, figs. 3, 9, and 13. Under Art. 69a (ii) (1), however, this does not constitute a reference to the new subgenus, of the nominal species referred to by Thomson.

3. Vaughan (in Dixon and Vaughan 1911, p. 555) referred the subspecific (or infrasubspecific) form *Caninia* aff. *cornucopiae* Michelin mut. D<sub>2-3</sub> Vaughan in Carruthers 1908, p. 169, to *Amplexizaphrentis*. This cannot be regarded, however, as an available subspecific name.

4. Lang, Smith and Thomas (1940, p. 16) were in fact the first authors to refer available nominal species to *Amplexizaphrentis* in the sense of Art. 69a (ii). The species so referred were the three implied in Vaughan's original citation of Thomson

1883, namely "*Zaphrentis bowerbanki* Edwards and Haime, Thomson, 1883, p. 368, pl. vi, fig. 3; *Z. edwardsiana* de Koninck, Thomson, 1883, p. 367, pl. vi, fig. 9; and *Z. guerangeri* Edwards and Haime, Thomson, 1883, p. 367, pl. vi, fig. 13". They designated the first of these as the type-species.

5. The nominal species thus designated as the type-species of *Amplexizaphrentis* is *Zaphrentis bowerbanki* Milne Edwards and Haime, 1851, p. 338, and the commission could place the generic name so defined on the official list without using its plenary powers. This would, however, cause some disturbance to current usage, as Dr. Shrestha has pointed out in para. 4 of his application. The first available name for *Z. bowerbanki* Thomson *non* Milne Edwards and Haime, is *Z. curvulena* Thomson, 1881, (see Hill 1940, p. 142), and I support Dr. Shrestha in asking for this species to be designated as the type-species under the plenary powers.

6. It may be pointed out that although Vaughan's original intention was to name a new subgenus of *Zaphrentis*, by basing the form on *Caninia* aff. *cornucopiae* Michelin mut. D<sub>2-3</sub>, he in fact erected a junior subjective synonym of *Caninia* Michelin 1840 (family CYATHOPSIDAE). This action was respected by Carruthers (1908, p. 158), and by Hudson (1945, p. 197, footnote) who challenged the action of Lang, Smith and Thomas in effectively transferring the taxon to the family HAPSIPHYLLIDAE. Current usage, however, follows the course taken by Lang, Smith and Thomas, and stability would best be served by following this course (see Hill 1956, p. F267; Sutherland 1958, p. 44).

7. The generic name *Zaphrentis* and its derivatives have always been treated as feminine and I ask that if *Amplexizaphrentis* is placed on the Official List, it be given this gender.

#### ADDITIONAL REFERENCE

SUTHERLAND, P. K. 1958. Carboniferous stratigraphy and Rugose coral faunas of Northeastern British Columbia. *Geol. Surv. Canada, Memoir* 295, 1-177, pl. 1-33.